

COUNTEREXAMPLES TO THEOREM 1 OF TURYN'S AND STORER'S PAPER "ON BINARY SEQUENCES"

JÜRGEN WILLMS

ABSTRACT. Explicit counterexamples to Theorem 1 of R. Turyn's and J. Storer's often-cited paper "On Binary Sequences" [1] are given. Theorem 2 of their paper is well known; it states that Barker sequences of odd length $n > 13$ do not exist. Since the proof of Theorem 2 relies on the incorrect Theorem 1, the proof of the often-cited Theorem 2 as presented in [1] is therefore not correct. It is not at all clear how Theorem 1 and its proof must be modified in [1] in order to get a correct proof of the well-known Theorem 2.

1. INTRODUCTION

Barker sequences are a prominent example of a family of binary sequences which have specific aperiodic autocorrelation properties. There is also a wide range of engineering applications where Barker sequences are used. For example, both the IEEE 802.11b wireless LAN standard and the GPS satellite navigation system use a Barker sequence for modulation purposes. A Barker sequence $x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$ is a binary sequence with the property that each of its aperiodic autocorrelation $c_k = \sum_{i=1}^{n-k} x_i x_{i+k}$ is in magnitude as small as possible, i. e. is either 0, 1 or -1. Theorem 2 of Turyn's and J. Storer's well-known paper "On Binary Sequences" [1] states that there exists no Barker sequence for odd sequence length $n > 13$. According to [2] "their proof is elementary, though somewhat complicated". The proof of Theorem 2 is based on Theorem 1 which is of a more technical nature. In the following, we will give explicit counterexamples to Turyn's and Storer's Theorem 1 (iv). As a consequence, the proof of the well-known Theorem 2 in [1] is not correct.

2. THEOREM 1 OF TURYN'S AND STORER'S PAPER "ON BINARY SEQUENCES"

In the following x will as in [1] always denote a binary sequence with length n . Thus we have $x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$ with $x_i \in \{-1, 1\}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$. As in [1] we will say that a binary sequence $x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$ will satisfy equation (k) for $1 \leq k < \frac{n-1}{2}$ if

$$(k) \quad \frac{1 + (-1)^{k+1}}{2} = \sum_{i=1}^k (-1)^{i+1} x_i x_{2k+2-i}.$$

Note that whether the sequence x satisfies equation (k) depends only on the first $2k+1$ elements of the sequence x , i. e. on $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{2k+1}$. Now we can state Theorem 1 of Turyn's and Storer's paper "On Binary Sequences" [1].

Date: 7.5.2014 .

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification. 11B83, 94A55, 68P30.

Key words and phrases. Barker sequence, binary sequence, autocorrelation,

Theorem 1. *Let x satisfy equation (k) for $1 \leq k \leq t$. Let $x_i=1$ for $1 \leq i \leq p$, $x_{p+1} = -1$; assume $p > 1$. Then*

- (i) $x_i x_{i+1} = x_{2i} x_{2i+1}$ for $1 \leq i \leq t$
- (ii) $p \leq 2t + 1$ implies p is odd
- (iii) $pj + r \leq 2t + 1$, $1 \leq r \leq p$ implies $x_{p(j-1)+r} = x_{p(j-1)+1}$
- (iv) $z_j = x_{p(j-1)+1}$ satisfy equations (k) for $k \leq \frac{t}{p}$

3. COUNTEREXAMPLES TO THEOREM 1

In this section we show that there are many counterexamples to Theorem 1 (iv). Consider a binary sequence x with length $n > 19$, $x_1 = 1$ and whose first 19 elements have the run length encoding $(3, 3, 6, 3, 2, 2)$. For such a sequence x we then have $x_1 = x_2 = x_3 = 1$, $x_4 = x_5 = x_6 = -1$, $x_7 = x_8 = \dots = x_{12} = 1$, $x_{13} = x_{14} = x_{15} = -1$, $x_{16} = x_{17} = 1$ and $x_{18} = x_{19} = -1$. Let p and z be as in Theorem 1. Hence $p = 3$ and $z = (1, -1, 1, 1, -1, 1, -1, \dots)$. Furthermore, it is not difficult to show that in this case x satisfies equation (k) for $1 \leq k \leq 9$; by setting $t = 9$ all assumptions of Theorem 1 are therefore satisfied. Now Theorem 1 (iv) claims that the binary sequence z satisfies equation (k) for all $1 \leq k \leq \frac{t}{p} = 3$. However, this is not true: z does not satisfy equation (k) for $k = 3$.

As a further example consider a binary sequence x of length $n > 33$, $x_1 = 1$ and whose first 33 elements have the run length encoding $(5, 5, 10, 5, 4, 4)$. Again let p and z be as in Theorem 1. Hence $p = 5$ and $z = (1, -1, 1, 1, -1, 1, -1, \dots)$. Hence x satisfies equation (k) for $1 \leq k \leq 16$; therefore, we can set $t = 16$ in Theorem 1. Again, Theorem 1 (iv) claims that the binary sequence z satisfies equation (k) for all $1 \leq k \leq \frac{t}{p} = 3.2$. However, this is not true: z does not satisfy equation (k) for $k = 3$.

Similar counterexamples for other values of $p \geq 3$ can be found by analyzing sequences whose run length encodings start with $(p, p, 2p, p, p-1, p-1, \dots)$. Other patterns like $(p, p, p, p, 2p, 2p, 2p-1, p-1, \dots)$ or $(p, p, 2p, p, 3p, p, p-1, 1, 3, \dots)$ also produce counterexamples to Theorem 1. For example, a counterexample for $p = 5$ is given by a binary sequences x of length $n > 53$ whose first 53 elements have the run encoding $(5, 5, 5, 5, 10, 10, 9, 4)$ or $(5, 5, 10, 5, 15, 5, 4, 1, 3)$; then x satisfies equation (k) for all for $1 \leq k \leq 26$. But although $5 \leq \frac{26}{p}$, the corresponding sequence z does not satisfy equation (k) for $k = 5$ which contradicts Theorem 1 (iv).

4. WHAT ABOUT THEOREM 2?

Theorem 2 in [1] says that there exists no Barker sequence of odd sequence length $n > 13$. It is well-known and often cited. However, in the proof of Theorem 2 Turyn and Storer use their Theorem 1 which is (at least in parts) contradicted by the above counterexamples. An analysis of the proof of Theorem 2 shows that the proof relies heavily on Theorem 1 (iii) but not explicitly on Theorem 1 (iv). However, in [1] by induction on t the statement (iii) of Theorem 1 is proved simultaneously with the statement (iv) of Theorem 1. Hence, the prove of Theorem 1 (iii) also relies on the incorrect Theorem 1 (iv); thus the proof of Theorem 2 in [1] is not correct. It is not at all clear how Theorem 1 and its proof must be modified in [1] in order to get a correct proof of the well-known Theorem 2. An alternative proof of Theorem 2 can for example be found in [3]. Although in many respects quite similar to the original proof of Turyn and Storer the in [3] presented proof does not rely on the

Theorem 1 (iii) or Theorem 1 (iv); instead Newton's identities are used in order to prove a result which is quite similar to Theorem 1 (iii).

REFERENCES

- [1] R. Turyn and J. Storer, "On binary sequences," *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 394–399, 1961.
- [2] P. Borwein and M. Mossinghoff, "Barker sequences and flat polynomials," *London Mathematical Society Lecture note series*, vol. 352, p. 71, 2008.
- [3] P. Borwein and T. Erdélyi, "A note on barker polynomials," *International Journal of Number Theory*, vol. 9, no. 03, pp. 759–767, 2013.

E-mail address: `willms.juergen@fh-swf.de`

INSTITUT FÜR COMPUTER SCIENCE, VISION AND COMPUTATIONAL INTELLIGENCE, FACH-
HOCHSCHULE SÜDWESTFALEN, D-59872 MESCHEDE, GERMANY